

Green University Planning Committee

December 6, 2010

MINUTES

3:00-4:30pm

Senate Chambers

Attendees:

Alexie Stephens, NUGSS
Anke Krey, Graduate Student
Arthur Fredeen, Professor, Ecosystem Science and Management
David Claus, Energy Manager
Daniel Ryan, Dean, College of Science and Management
Danielle Smyth, Green University Research Project Manager
Eileen Bray, Vice President Administration and Finance
Gail Fondahl, Vice-President Research
John Young, Dean, College of Arts, Social, and Health Sciences
Ken Wilkening, Associate Professor, International Studies
Kyle Aben, PICS
Leslie Burke, Purchasing Agent
Nadia Nowak, NUGSS
Rob van Adrichem, Vice-President External Relations
Shelley Rennick, Director, Facilities Management
Trevor Fuson, CUPE

Regrets:

Alex Lautensach, Assistant Professor, Education, Terrace Campus
George Iwama, President
Mark Dale, Provost (Chair)
Sarah Boyd-Noel, PGPIRG

Recorder: Danielle Smyth, Green University Research Project Manager

1. Approval of Agenda

- Approved

2. Updates:

Local Food Day – November 17

3. Green Fund (old business)

a) Pinecrete Green Fund Proposal – E. Bray

- This item was tabled until the next meeting.

<p>ACTION: D Smyth will provide G Fondahl with the Pinecrete proposal and she will investigate ownership of the product.</p>

b) Bear Proof Bin Proposal – D. Smyth

- D Smyth reported that the request of this proposal had already been partially fulfilled by Facilities (i.e. a Bear Proof garbage bin has replaced regular garbage bin in the bus loop) and that perhaps it was no longer appropriate to approve this proposal.

- S Rennick added that that the requested bins system is not in line with our current contractor's collection system and this will create major logistics challenges for Facilities staff. Furthermore S Rennick indicated that purchasing such bins falls under the budgetary responsibilities of the Facilities Department not the Green Fund.
- N Nowak questioned whether placing a bin on the trail connector was necessary.
- S Rennick indicated that there have been littering issues in that area and that they do need a bear proof garbage bin at that location, especially given that the new trail system will likely increase traffic in that area.

MOTION: To decline funding the Bear Proof Bin Proposal.

(D Ryan/A Fredeen) CARRIED

Update on Approved Green Fund Proposal

- K Wilkening noted that he had received a letter from the School of Nursing (Greening SON Project) indicating that that they accepted the conditions and funding. NUGSS (Pub LED Lighting Project) has not sent their letter of acceptance yet.

4. Green Fund (new business)

a) Revised Green Fund Guidelines (attached) – D. Smyth

- The Green Fund Guidelines have been revised to include the following criteria:
“Incorporates elements of public education and raises awareness about sustainability across the UNBC campus community”.

MOTION: To approve the addition *“Incorporates elements of public education and raises awareness about sustainability across the UNBC campus community”* to the Green Fund Guidelines.

(D Ryan/E Bray) CARRIED

- K Wilkening suggested changing the October intake to an earlier date in September to provide equal spacing between intakes
- S Rennick noted that the date was initially pushed back into October to provide new staff, faculty and students with the opportunity to familiarize themselves with the process
- A Fredeen also mentioned that September is a very busy time for most people on campus and that keeping the deadline in October would be preferable
- D Ryan questioned whether we need three intakes and that perhaps two would be sufficient (i.e. mid fall and mid winter)
- K Wilkening indicated that the Green Fund Subcommittee is intended to play a more interactive role with proposers and that having three cycles provides the opportunity to do so. He also mentioned that having three intakes keeps the workload manageable for the Subcommittee
- K Aben noted that regardless of whether there are two or three intakes, the two week review period for the GUPC is essential
- E Bray added that having three intake periods maintains the profile of the initiative
- D Ryan suggested removing the dates from the Green Fund Guidelines and setting the three intake period to coincide with semester dates
- G Fondahl stated that deadlines should be clearly set and that all correspondence should clearly note these deadlines (i.e. deadlines to report on progress at mid and end point of projects)
- D Claus asked about the requirement for a GUPC member to be assigned to each proposal
- D Smyth noted that this has not yet happened with proposals

- G Fondahl suggested that the Green Fund Guidelines should clarify in the Project Process section that “the Green Fund Subcommittee will assign a GUPC member to each Green Fund proposal”.
- K Wilkening recommended that we see the process through for one full year (three intakes) before making significant changes to the process and guidelines
- D Ryan recommended adding a “Section F” to the Green Fund Guidelines that states “Guidelines will be reviewed following the January 2011 intake period and changes will be incorporated prior to the October 2011 intake”.

b) Green Fund Sub-committee TOR (attached) – K. Wilkening

- K Wilkening presented a draft Green Fund Sub-committee TOR that was developed following two rounds of experience accepting Green Fund Proposals. The purpose of the Green Fund Sub-committee TOR is to outline the Green Fund Proposal evaluation procedure in greater detail, for example, specifically stating that there will be a two week comment period for GUPC members following each intake period.

MOTION: To accept the draft Green Fund Sub-committee TOR.
(A Fredeen/K Aben) CARRIED

- G Fondahl asked how members of the Green Fund Sub-committee (GFSC) are to be chosen and what the term of appointment was
- J Young suggested that the Chair of the GFSC and the Green University Research Project Manager be responsible for recruiting and added that GFSC membership should have a larger proportion of GUPC members. He also agreed that specifying the term of appointment was important, especially if a member were to become disengaged
- K Wilkening stated that current members on the GFSC are serving a one year term
- G Fondahl recommended specifying if the term was renewable and if so for how many consecutive terms. She also suggested that members serve a two year term and that terms be staggered.
- J Young suggested that the GFSC include 5 members and a Chair (total of 6) and questioned whether the two week comment period to the GUPC was necessary
- S Rennick clarified that the two week comment period was requested by members of the GUPC
- K Wilkening noted that GUPC feedback during this period was optional and that members of the GUPC would only be expected to review those proposals recommended by the GFSC
- K Aben highlighted that the GFSC has had difficulty maintaining a membership five, indicating that requiring mostly GUPC membership might create challenges
- A Fredeen noted that as a “subcommittee” the GFSC should technically be made up of GUPC members but suggested that outside members could be vetted by the GUPC instead
- J Young expressed concern that the current TOR suggests that the Chair of the GFSC can exclusively choose members
- K Wilkening explained that the Chair could be responsible for soliciting names and then seek approval from the GUPC
- K Wilkening explained that conflict of interest was also a concern during the previous proposal intake (i.e. subcommittee members were also part of a proposal team)
- D Ryan also suggested indicating in the TOR who will be responsible for following up with proposal teams once Green Funds have been released.

MOTION: To table the discussion on the Green Fund Sub-committee TOR until our February meeting.
(G Fondahl/J Young) CARRIED

ACTION: GUPC members should send further comments on the Green Fund Subcommittee TOR to Ken Wilkening.

- c) Working groups vs. subcommittees – K. Wilkening**
- K Wilkening indicated that two different entities that require GUPC support are evolving: subcommittees (formal sub group of the GUPC, TOR) and working groups (i.e. issues based, could be dissolved or created as needed)
 - K Wilkening noted that one of the groups, the Green Teaching Working Group, provides a point of discussion on this issue. The GUPC accepted the Green Teaching Working Group without understanding exactly how the group will function and what its intended purpose is
 - J Young suggested that the Green Teaching Working Group draft a TOR for their group
 - G Fondahl highlighted that “green teaching” fits with the University plan and stated that this issue should be addressed with Mark Dale present
 - K Wilkening announced that Annie Booth has started an ad hoc effort focused on sustainability in the curriculum; with two groups recently formed he agreed with J Young that the GUPC needs clarification on what was approved

MOTION: To adjourn.
(A Fredeen/S Rennick) CARRIED

Adjournment – 4:28 pm

Next Meeting – January 10, 9:30-11:00 am, Senate Chambers